

10/714,292

Attorney Docket No. 14542

REMARKS**I. Claim Status.**

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. This Response and Amendment amends Claims 1, 6, 10, 13-16 and 18, and cancels Claim 2.

II. Specification Amendments.**A. Page 4, Paragraph 2.**

The heading "DRAWINGS" on page 4, paragraph 2 has been changed to "BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS". This amendment is a minor stylistic change in format to the specification and does not add new matter. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

B. Page 6, Paragraph 3.

The chemical formulas in the table on page 6, paragraph 3, for ACLAR CTFE, and HALAR ECTFE have been amended to correct typographical errors. The chemical formulas for these named polymers are known to those of skill in the art and the amendment to the Specification corrects obvious typographical errors. Accordingly, this amendment does not add new matter. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Amendments.**A. Claims 1 and 18.**

The amendments to Claims 1 and 18 incorporate the limitation of dependent Claim 2, now cancelled and changes the term "film" to "sheet" in reference to the fluorocarbon polymer, and adds the term "sheet" in reference to the substrate. The term "sheet" is used in reference to the substrate and the fluorocarbon polymer in the specification, for example, on page 3, paragraph 1, and on page 7, paragraph 4. Accordingly, these amendments do not add new matter. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 6 and 10.

Claims 6 and 10 have been amended to correct obvious typographical errors. Accordingly, these amendments do not add new matter. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

10/714,292

Attorney Docket No. 14542

C. Claims 13-14.

Claims 13 and 14 have been amended to claim the chemical formula for ACLAR® CTFE, a chlorotrifluoroethene 1,1-difluoroethene copolymer, described on page 6 of the specification. This amendment corrects a typographical error and does not add new matter. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

D. Claims 15-16.

Claims 15 and 16 have been amended to claim the chemical formula for HALAR® ECTFE, an ethane chlorotrifluoroethene copolymer, described on page 6 of the specification. This amendment corrects a typographical error and does not add new matter. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

IV. The Objections To The Specification.

The Office has rejected the specification for the reasons stated in numbered paragraph 1 of the Office Action. The amendments to the specification are believed to obviate the objections. Withdrawal of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Objections.

The Office has objected to Claims 6 and 10 for the reasons stated in numbered paragraph 2 of the Office Action. The amendments to Claims 6 and 10 are believed to obviate the objections. Withdrawal of the objections to Claims 6 and 10 is respectfully requested.

VI. The Rejections Under 35 USC § 102.**A. The Rejection Over Araki et al.**

The Office has rejected Claims 1-12 and 17 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Araki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,716,497) for the reasons stated in numbered paragraph 5 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration based on the following remarks.

As stated by the Office, Araki discloses a "fluorine-containing primer layer applied to a substrate and a top layer over the primer of a fluorine-containing polymer having no functional groups (column 13, lines 30-43). Office Action, page 3, paragraph 5. However, Claim 1 is limited to a first layer comprising a *sheet* of transparent substrate polymer material; and a second

10/714,292

Attorney Docket No. 14542

layer comprising a transparent fluorocarbon polymer *sheet*; wherein the second layer is bonded to the first layer by a transparent adhesive layer disposed between the first layer and the second layer.

The polymers described in Araki et al. are films (e.g., granulated polymers that are spray or electrostatically applied to a substrate). Araki et al. does not disclose two polymer sheets, one sheet being a fluorocarbon polymer sheet, that are bonded by a transparent adhesive layer.

In addition, Applicants invention is non-obvious over Araki et al. Araki et al. teaches that composite material produced by using an adhesive is insufficient in heat resistance, chemical resistance and water resistance of its adhesive layer, it cannot maintain adhesive force due to a change in temperature and environment, and lacks in reliability. See, e.g. col. 3, lines 1-14.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that all pending claims are patentable over Araki et al. and request withdrawal of this basis for rejection.

B. The Rejection Over Friedman et al.

The Office has rejected Claims 1 and 3-17 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Friedman et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0162028) for the reasons stated in numbered paragraph 6 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration based on the following remarks.

1. Friedman et al Is Not Prior Art Under 35 USC § 102(b).

Initially, Applicants would like to point out that U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0162028 is not properly cited as a reference under 35 USC § 102(b). Applicants believe that the appropriate basis for rejection is 35 USC § 102(a). The present Application has a filing date of November 13, 2003. U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0162028 has a publication date of August 28, 2003, which is not more than one year prior to the filing date of the present Application in the United States, as required under 35 USC § 102(b). Accordingly, the proper statutory basis for the rejection is under 35 USC § 102(a) and not 35 USC § 102(b).

Applicants request that if the Examiner does not withdraw the rejection altogether, that the Examiner amend the statutory basis for the rejection.

2. Friedman et al. Does Not Disclose Applicants Invention.

10/714,292

Attorney Docket No. 14542

Friedman et al. does not disclose two polymer sheets, one sheet being a fluorocarbon polymer sheet, that are bonded by a transparent adhesive layer as claimed by Applicants.

In addition, Applicants invention is non-obvious over Friedman et al. Friedman et al. teaches layers that are adhered without the benefit of adhesive. See., e.g, [Par. 001]. Accordingly, there is no motivation to modify or combine Friedman et al. to arrive at Applicants invention.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that all pending claims are patentable over Friedman et al. and request withdrawal of this basis for rejection.

VII. The Rejection Under 35 USC § 103.

The Office has rejected Claims 18-23 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delnay et al. (U.S. Patent 3,410,619) in view of Araki et al. (U.S. Patent 6,716,397) for the reasons stated in numbered paragraph 8 of the Office Action. The Office has also rejected Claims 18-23 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delnay et al. (U.S. Patent 3,410,619) in view of Friedman et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0162028) for the reasons stated in numbered paragraph 9 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 USC § 103(a) and request reconsideration based on the following remarks.

A. The Rejection Over Delnay et al. in view of Araki et al.

As admitted by the Office, Delnay et al. does not teach the composition of the safety glass. There is no motivation to combine the box described in Delnay et al. with the polymers described in Araki et al., as the polymers described in Araki et al. are films, and not sheets, as claimed by applicants. Further, Araki et al. teaches that composite material produced by using an adhesive is insufficient in heat resistance, chemical resistance and water resistance of its adhesive layer, it cannot maintain adhesive force due to a change in temperature and environment, and lacks in reliability. See, e.g, col. 3, lines 1-14. Accordingly, there is no motivation to modify or combine the invention disclosed in Delnay et al. and/or Araki et al. to arrive at Applicants invention.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that all pending claims are patentable over Delnay et al. in view of Araki et al. and request withdrawal of this basis for rejection.

10/714,292

Attorney Docket No. 14542

B. The Rejection Over Delnay et al. in view of Friedman et al.

As admitted by the Office, Delnay et al. does not teach the composition of the safety glass. There is no motivation to combine or modify the box described in Delnay et al. with the invention described in Friedman et al., as Friedman teaches away from the combination. As noted by the Office, Friedman teaches a laminate formed without adhesive, which thus reduces its flammability. Accordingly, there is no motivation to modify or combine the invention disclosed in Delnay et al. and/or Friedman et al. to arrive at Applicants invention.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that all pending claims are patentable over Delnay et al. in view of Friedman et al. and request withdrawal of this basis for rejection.


CONCLUSION

The Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested. If the present amendments and remarks do not place the Application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned directly if there are any issues that can be resolved by telephone with the Applicants representative.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge \$1,020, the fee for a 3-month extension to deposit account No. 19-2090. No other fee is believed due by this Response. However, if any other fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fees to deposit account No. 19-2090.

Respectfully Submitted,
SHELDON & MAK PC

Date: October 5, 2005

By: 
Kristin C. Hübner, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 50,139

SHELDON & MAK PC
225 South Lake Avenue, 9th Floor
Pasadena, California 91101-3005

Telephone (626) 796-4000
Facsimile (626) 795-6321